

Notes from Portland Harbor Managers meeting

December 13, 2005

** The managers met in the evening after a day-long technical meeting between the LWG, EPA and partners to discuss and clarify EPA's December 2, 2005, *Identification of Round 3 Data Gaps* memo. The notes below were taken by Mikell O'Mealy, DEQ Portland Harbor Project Coordinator. **

Reactions from the technical meeting

- LWG consultants are concerned about the potential scope of the data collection effort outlined in EPA's December 2 memo, and implications for the RI/FS schedule.
 - In December and January, EPA and partners need to further define the scope and scale of the effort.
- Specific LWG uncertainties or concerns include:
 - direction to collect more fish tissue than the LWG anticipated,
 - the scale of bank sampling needed between the Mean High and Ordinary High Water Marks,
 - sampling downstream and upstream of the ISA to determine background levels and site boundaries, and
 - Fate and Transport modeling.
- LWG consultants are also concerned that collection of new data (e.g., sampling upstream of Willamette Falls, upstream fish tissue collection, etc.) may lead to more questions and an iterative, ongoing sampling effort, rather than providing clear answers.
 - EPA and partners need to provide more information on (1) the scale of the sampling effort and (2) how the new data that is collected will be evaluated and used in the RI/FS.
 - Consider developing a written process that describes how new information will be treated and considered as it comes up. Written clarification could provide EPA and partners certainty about how to handle new data, and it could assuage LWG concerns about an iterative, ongoing sampling process.
- LWG consultants may not have voiced all of their questions or concerns in today's meeting. Managers need to understand *all* questions and concerns now to resolve them and move forward efficiently and effectively.
- Take home messages from today's meeting include:
 - Everything in EPA's December 2 memo reflects the requirements of CERCLA. None of it is NRDA. However, "more than CERCLA" may be required to achieve EPA's management goal, and this should be acknowledged and clarified.
 - "Deleterious effects," as mentioned in EPA's management goal and objectives for the risk assessments, does not go beyond direct linkages to growth, survival and reproduction.

Next steps

Immediately:

- LWG managers will send an email to their consultants that asks for (1) all questions or concerns about EPA's data gaps memo, beyond those expressed at the December 13 meeting, (2) "bullets" that describe alternatives for filling the data needs or performing analyses that EPA identified in the December 2 memo (Gene on upstream sampling, Carl on Fate and Transport modeling, etc.), and (3) identification of time critical tasks and deliverables related to EPA's December 2 memo.
- LWG will work on adding pertinent data to the LWG portal to assist EPA's development of a scope of work (see the data sets listed in EPA's December 2 memo, at the bottom of page 4). EPA and partners need this data to be integrated in the Query Manager database so that it can be pulled up with GIS and evaluated. (How long will this take?)

By mid-January:

- LWG consultants provide "bullets" to EPA on alternate suggestions for filling data needs or performing analyses. EPA and partners will consider these in developing a scope of work. Mid-January discussions between EPA and LWG consultants may be needed to clarify LWG suggestions.
- EPA, partners and the LWG together identify time critical tasks and deliverables, and consider preparations to start work on critical documents in February/March.

By the end of January:

- EPA and partners will provide a scope of work to the LWG that describes the level of effort needed to fill the data needs.
- EPA, partners and LWG managers meet to determine whether the scope of work is doable within the next year and/or what the schedule implications are.

By the end of February:

- LWG will gain management approval to move forward on scope of work.
- Collaboration among EPA, partners and the LWG will continue to advance critical tasks.
- Preparations for the March 7 Milestone meeting will be underway (agenda, assignments, background materials, etc.)

Other tasks:

- Consider a joint work planning exercise that maps out workloads and priorities for EPA, partners and the LWG over the next year.
- Consider holding regular updates at Portland Harbor manager meetings on the project schedule and feedback from technical meetings (to address and resolve any problems that arise; an example is unclear analytical methods in the recent benthic predictive model meeting)
- Val asked Jim to consider talking with Natural Resource Trustees about NRDA needs and opportunities to combine RIFS and NRDA sampling efforts.